

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/460,962

Filing Date: December 14, 1999

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR DETECTION OF COMMUNICATION SIGNAL LOSS

Page 2

Atty Dkt: P1582US00

REMARKS

Claims 17 and 18 are added by this Amendment. As a result, claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. No claims have been amended. The pending Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 5,877,745 ("Beeteson") and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,175,308 ("Tallman"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Beeteson patent involves a data processing system featuring peripheral devices (e.g., keyboard, mouse, printer, etc.) which are equipped with a transceiver for two-way communication with the system unit. The Beeteson patent, we believe the Office Action intends to say, does not disclose an alarm responsive to a second signal. Furthermore, the Beeteson patent does not disclose or suggest an alarm responsive to the absence of a second signal.

The Office Action relies upon the secondarily cited Tallman patent to disclose an alarm responsive to a second signal. The Tallman patent involves a personal duress security system that features mobile units which send a "watchdog signal" back to a personal computer if the mobile unit detects one of several alarm conditions. For example, the mobile unit transmits a watchdog signal back to computer monitor system 280 if the mobile unit is tilted more than 60 degrees, indicating a "man down" condition.¹ The Tallman patent does not disclose or suggest an alarm responsive to the absence of a second signal.

It is respectfully submitted that the hypothetical combination of the Beeteson patent and the Tallman patent lacks a number of features of the claimed invention. For example, the hypothetical combination does not disclose or suggest "an alarm responsive to a determination that the second signal *has not been received* by the at least one peripheral device," and that "the alarm notif[ies] the user of the loss of wireless connection," as recited in claim 1. The hypothetical combination does not disclose or suggest "an alarm signal notifying a user that the communication between the host computer and the first peripheral has been lost," as recited in claim 13. Furthermore, the hypothetical combination does not disclose or suggest "transmitting a message to alert the user of the loss of wireless communication," as recited in claim 15 or

¹ Tallman, col. 7, lines 29-46.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 09/460,962

Filing Date: December 14, 1999

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR DETECTION OF COMMUNICATION SIGNAL LOSS

Page 3

Atty Dkt: P1582US00

"transmitting a message concerning the loss of communication," as recited in claim 16.

Accordingly, the Beeteson patent and the Tallman patent, either taken singly or as a hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present invention.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, notification to that effect is earnestly requested. In the event that issues arise in the application which may readily be resolved via telephone, the Examiner is kindly invited to telephone the Gateway, Inc. attorney at (605)232-1967 to facilitate prosecution of the application.

It is believe that no fee is owed for the present Amendment. However, if necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0439.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 16, 2002

By



Scott Charles Richardson

Reg. No. 43,436